America's Only Monthly Revisionist Newsletter

Smith's Report

ON THE HOLOCAUST CONTROVERSY

Number 73 WWW.CODOH.ORG October 2000

THE CAMPUS PROJECT

Bradley R. Smith

The Project started off about like I reported it would last month. On 5 September *The Beacon* at **William Paterson University** published verbatim a 1,140-word letter to the editor in which I responded to the irresponsible reaction of WPU president Arnold Speert and a number of professors in condemning the *Beacon* for running CODOH's "Holocaust Studies" ad (see **SR** 72). Printing my letter was a stalwart act by the *Beacon* editor.

On 6 September *The Daily Collegian* at **U Massachusetts-Amherst**, the largest student newspaper in New England, ran the first of what was to be six modest ads, spaced out one time a week for six weeks. This is the ad where I ask students to "Ignore the Thought Police, Read the Evidence, and Judge for Yourself." But on 9 September I received a telephone call from a *Beacon* ad rep informing me that there had been too much reaction by "students" to the CODOH ad and that the paper was pulling it. It made no difference that we had a signed contract and that I had paid in advance.

I usually let these things go. It's part of the game, this is one way that the game is played, and it costs too much time and energy to argue the matter -- unless it's a matter of grave importance. So -- I said okay and let it go.

Audrey, being new at this game, was scandalized that complaints by -- how many? -- students would cause an editor to break a contract and pull an ad asking for intellectual freedom. She didn't want to let

(Continued on page 5)

CODOHWeb Heating Up

Mainstreaming the Message

George Brewer

As the year 2000 academic calendar began, the Committee for Open Debate on the Holocaust geared itself once again to take its message of historical revisionism to the widest possible public.

Part of this involved linking CODOH to the mostly German language Website of Germar Rudolf, VHO. Another part involved a new series of ads, which would focus on directing students to CODOHWeb. A third involved Bradley Smith's pungent response to John Silber's widely disseminated defense of Mr. Holocaust, Elie Wiesel. Finally, CODOH's path-breaking revisionist journal was converted to E-zine format. In the weeks after Labor Day, we waited with anticipation to see the results. The results have been all that we could have asked for.

More Accesses Than Ever

The first good news is that the hits on the CODOH Website -- each hit represents the visit of an Internet "Web surfer" to a CODOH page -- are once again at peak levels. Back in 1998, when statistics began to be calculated in our new format, it was normal for our revisionist pages to be accessed perhaps a few thousand times a day. In 1999, during the summer months, the total number of daily hits dipped down to a then low of about 5,000 a day. In the fall of 1999, hand in hand with the Campus Project, the hits kept climbing to ten thousand, then fifteen thousand, and then over 20,000 hits per day during the Irving-Lipstadt libel trial.

(Continued on page 3)

LETTERS

I note from a recent *Smith's Report* that you are hurting for money. Let me give you a million dollars worth of good advice. It's simple advice, and obvious, too, but it ought to worth plenty to someone like you who needs it badly.

A couple years ago I gave you several hundred bucks to help pay off your debts because you said someone was going to match contributions and I wanted to give you the most I could. I was happy to do it – you were (and are) doing very important work.

After I sent you the money, I never heard a word from you. Nothing. I don't expect you to fawn all over me, but nothing? I felt used. And I haven't forgotten it. Which is why I am not answering your most recent appeal for funds.

But I am still going to give you a million dollars worth of advice. Here is. Don't treat your big contributors like you treated me. People who give you big bucks are likely to give you more if you just treat them with a modicum of decency. Remember, the guy who writes the check to you is doing it because it makes him feel good, and it's just good business to pay a little attention to him and make him feel better.

Brad, I know you are understaffed and overwhelmed with work. But if you neglect your "best customers," there is only one word for it – stupidity. Get smart, Brad. Don't turn your best customers into "subscribers only," which is what you turned me into. It's your lifeline, Brad. If you neglect it, you are either going to go down, or you are going to survive hand-to-mouth, which is pretty much what you are doing now, as I understand it.

One final thing. Don't apologize to me. My case is closed. But there are others that are not. Make a little list so you never miss them. Work on it. And good luck.

J.B, Florida

Your letter is going to strike a cord with a number of my readers, some of whom have suffered indignities beyond what you describe here. There was a time, back in Visalia, when I responded to every contribution I received. Then I lost the services of the young lady who was working for me, went bankrupt, moved our furniture and family to an unfinished house in Baja, and started all over again by myself. That's no excuse of course for the failure of good manners and good sense that you refer to, but it is my way to introduce to all my readers, now, the good news that all contributions are now being acknowledged – thanks to a number of letters like yours, and the organizational skills of my right-hand man, Audrey.

The other day Audrey pointed out something a little peculiar about my character. Everyday I go to our private mail drop, leave our outgoing and pickup the incoming. Back at the house I put the incoming mail on the dinning room table, then go upstairs to the office and back to work. Audrey always wants to know how many checks came in and for how much. I tell her I'll open the mail later. Sometimes I let the incoming pile up for four and five days without opening it. There's always something more important in the moment than finding out if we received some money and how much. Without the money I can't do the work or take of my family or anything else, but in the moment there's always something more important. It's a little peculiar. Audrey says it's worse than that.

I expect to clean this matter up, and that this will be the last time that I will feel obligated to print such a letter — as an apology to a good number of you.

What a fine little book *Confessions* is. Where is part II, part III? Your bewilderment – not hidden but expressed – how different from our wise ones. What you do isn't easy. There are wonderful touches and a fine style. You are a superb "melting agent" for truth. Your opening chapter can treat most any mind so that it can wet itself with further information. Not easy to do. The truth usually rolls off in little dusty balls – like rain hitting land too dry to get wet.

I am in this struggle for good, for keeps. My wife had a Jewish grandfather. Thus my children and grandchildren are subject to relapse into a world one old boy left, or so I'm told. Anyway, for me, you have it right. On with the show, out with the facts so we can get on to other still more interesting matters. I just had some good luck. I want to pass some on – keep at it.

S.B., New Mexico

Just rediscovered this letter. It's not dated. Of course, I have no recollection of responding to it. I had to ask David Thomas, our resident engineer, if "melting agent" is a scientific term or a literary one. I learned it's a real one. I see now it is a literary term too. Re parts two and three of Confessions*: it took me too long. I'll never do them. I do have a ms. about ready to go. I'm too busy, it seems, to know how to make time to wrap it up.*

I have not finished reading everything on the CODOH Website but you can count on it that I will! Would you please put me on your e-mail list if you have one? I ran into your site because a friend recommended a listing called Bigoted Web Sites. David Irving made a video in which he shares the resistance he experienced when questioning the Jewish Holocaust story. Ever since then I have been very receptive to learning more about why I can't learn more about "the holocaust" from the salesmen who sell the story. Why is it such a sin to question them? Why do they need terms/weapons like hate monger or nazi to make people afraid to question their story? Staying in touch with you means learning more.

M.O., via email.

I filed this information away in my memory and told a few people about it. Then, about two weeks ago, I was fueling the truck at 1:30 in the morning in a town in Pennsylvania and walked over to a driver fueling his truck. His truck had Fed Ex signs plastered all over it. I had driver's pay on my mind and I asked him if he was a union driver.

He said, no, he was an owner-operator.

I said: "By the way. I notice you have a refrigerated unit. I've never seen one installed under the box like that. What do you need refrigeration for? I would think refrigeration unnecessary to haul envelopes and packages?"

"Sometimes I carry pharmaceuticals and they needs refrigeration."

It occurred to me, I don't know why, that what he might mean was blood plasma and body parts for transplants.

I asked him: "Do you ever haul stiffs?"

"Yeah, every once in a while."

"You take them to hospitals?"

"Yeah, and to military installations."

"No kidding," I said? "This is interesting. What do they do with stiffs at military installations?"

"I got no idea what they do with them there. I'd like to know that myself."

Now I get the feeling that this all makes sense.

I said: "You want me to tell you what they do with the stiffs there?"

"Yeah, I'd like to know."

And I told him what I had been told by the other driver.

"I'll be dammed."

I said: "Do you believe that story?"

"I wouldn't be a bit surprised if that's what they do," he said

So I paid for the fuel, bought a coffee, and drove off.

A couple weeks later I told that story to a young professional couple and they didn't blink.

> "Oh, yeah," the guy said. "I knew that. They use corpses to test what happens to them in car wrecks. They drop them from helicopters."

That's what he said. Now I ask you, Bradley. Is this going on? I mean, here I am, willing to donate my body to science, to donate a badly needed organ to some poor kid who needs it, but maybe they'll put me in a building drop a bomb on me?

Well! No need to answer. All the best, and let me know if something comes up. I too will keep you posted.

As ever.

Rolf Hermes

Several days passed before I saw the picture that Rolf's letter suggests.

Millions of people are being shunted about from one end of Europe to the other. Millions are being exterminated in weapons of mass destruction. Tens of thousands of truck drivers from a dozen European countries are crisscrossing every highway, city and town in Central and Eastern Europe, but there is no body of literature from them, or about them. It's as if these working class men saw no evil, heard no evil, and avoided the temptation to tell one another anything they heard about the extermination of an entire people. Before Rolf's letter, I hadn't thought about the German truck drivers, or any other ordinary workingmen.

Faurisson continued from page 1

then begin asking for more money, and more privileges.

Best wishes, if I may say so.

Robert Faurisson

Revisionism is collapsing! We have to face reality!

Faurisson has been saying this, as he notes, since 1998. He most likely thought about it for some time before he said it. Is it true? How true is it? We are all aware of the new difficulties we are facing, particularly since the catastrophe that has overwhelmed the Institute for Historical Review, which through the mid-1990s was the center of everything for all of us.

Still, "collapsing" is one thing, while "having collapsed" is another. It is not unusual for radical intellectual arguments to have their ups and downs, their great successes, followed by their collapse, to rise or not rise again. Communism, fascism, democracy—they have all had their ups and downs from the beginning. The ideal of intellectual freedom, institutionalized (ideally) by the Greeks, has never won the day, completely, anywhere. The advancement of Holocaust revisionist argument, which is a part of, and contributes to, intellectual freedom, will have its ups and downs. We are no different than all others in that respect.

I was going to do a rundown here of how revisionism is, in fact, "collapsing" in Europe and America both. I'm not going to bother. We are all aware of the problems that plague revisionism. They are the same that plague the ideals of liberty everywhere, which include, particularly, those of a free press, and on campus of free inquiry.

But revisionism has never been easy. In much of Europe it has always meant persecution by the State, a sea of slander by cultural bigots, loss of career, and oftentimes poverty and physical violence. In America it has meant all of the above, except State persecution. Unlike the Europeans, Americans still enjoy the remnants of a free society.

What is important to say at this moment in time is that while there is a lot of bad news, it is not *all* bad news.

Germar Rudolf has taken over CODOH's *The Revisionist* and made it the world's primary English-language revisionist quarterly. He has published the first English-language edition of his full *The Rudolf Report: Expert Report on Chemical and Technical Aspects of the "Gas Chambers"* of Auschwitz. He has published the new, updated version of Arthur Butz's *The Hoax of the Twentieth Century*. In addition, he has published either the first edition or first English-language edition of another dozen revisionist titles. And he is still publishing his renowned German quarterly *Vierteljahreshefte für freie Geschichtsfor-*

schung. Write for his list at Castle Hill Publishers, PO Box 257768, Chicago, IL 60625, USA. Or in Europe at: PO Box 118Hastings, TN34 3ZQ, UK.

David Irving is no longer "banned" from entering Germany! He announced this stunning news on 11 October in his online *Action Report*. He wrote: "In the morning mail, there is unexpected news from the German foreign ministry:"

> *According to information from the German Office of Administration there is no longer a ban on you entering the Federal Republic of Germany. The entry ban has been annulled.*

Stunning! Completely unexpected. Here, anyhow.

Meanwhile, Irving is already off on a ten-day lecture and book-signing tour in Hungary to promote his book on the 1956 Hungarian uprising. *Uprising*, which was first published in 1981 in English and German, was never published in Hungarian. Well, now it is, and Irving is going to be all over that country beginning 20 October. The subjects of the lectures will include "The 1956 Hungarian Revolution, controversial issues of the 2nd World War, the developing findings on research into the Jewish Holocaust, the struggle for Real History, and the fight for freedom of speech."

Sounds good to me.

How far is Hungary from Germany? It's more or less a hop, a skip and a jump. My imagination soars.

Irving has been producing what is arguably the most professional revisionist-related Web page on the Internet, as well as all the other work he does. None of us are operating on the Web with a comparable energy and level of sophistication.

Ingrid (Rimland) Zundel is producing an immense amount of work on the Internet through her ZUNDELSITE. We hear from her everyday as she works—and works and works and works—to support the struggle to get her husband, Ernst, out of his Canadian prison, out of the waiting clutches of the German State, and back in America where he has chosen to live. ZUNDELSITE is very important for revisionism, and is more influential now than it has ever been. Its primary importance, at this time, lies in Ingrid's powerful, living, day-to-day demonstration of the way those people operate who are desperate to censor revisionist arguments and destroy revisionism, and how Ernst bears it all with quiet courage and good humor.

Arthur Butz. The brand new, slightly edited, 2003 edition of his 1976 book that in America and England started it all, *The Hoax of the Twentieth Century*, is now available from Castle Hill Publishers. Butz notes that the "inferior typographic quality of the original is finally a thing of the past." There is a PDF version of the new edition as well. It can be downloaded from the Castle Hill web page.

Fredrick Tobin has just published his *Fight or Flight: The Personal Face of Revisionism*. It's 650 pages of autobiographical recollections, accounts of revisionist conferences worldwide, conversations and updates with and on nearly all revisionist workers and independent figures from WWII. Tobin reflects on all the major revisionist topics of the day. At the same time, Tobin's Adelaide Institute is reaching the ten-year mark, and it's Internet (www.adelaideinstitute.org/) outreach work is growing increasingly effective. If you're not online you can write to him at Peace Books, PO Box 3300, Norwood SA 5067, Australia.

Von Hannover is developing "The Revisionist Forum" on the World Wide Web where revisionists, and those who want to challenge revisionist arguments, can come together. Fritz Berg, Tom Moran and others have their own pages on the site. The site is beautifully put together, and is growing. It has promise of becoming the grand meeting place of live revisionist argument, replacing the CODOH forum that ran from the mid-1990s through 2001. The Forum is at: http://www.yourforum.org/.

Walter Mueller is printing 20,000 copies monthly of his lively and informational tabloid *Community News*. Distribution is increasingly widespread, reaching across the country and into Canada. At the same time his email newsletter *The Truth is Back* (*thetruthisback@yahoo.com*) is published on the Internet every day. Mueller's way of expressing himself is forbidden in American media—in most world media—and sometimes I am uncomfortable with it. But I notice that every day when *The Truth Is Back* arrives in my email box that I open it immediately wondering what new information or insight he has come up with this time.

Carlos Porter, Russ Granata, and **Serge Thion**, among others, have large revisionist sites on the Web and are constantly updating them with new information and cross linkings.

There is much more going on via the Internet—much more—than I can possibly encapsulate here. I notice that I have left out of the above listing my own book, *Break His Bones*, which was published last year. What it all adds up to is that while revisionism may be, is, "collapsing" in some ways, it is far from "collapsed." Revisionist arguments have never been more widely available to more people in more parts of the globe than they are today. The Internet phenomenon is growing explosively. There is no indication that it will so much as even pause.

Nevertheless, in some way, I think most of us would agree that revisionism is in crises. Some kind of crises. We can't—perhaps we don't really want to—put our finger on what it is. It's as if revisionism is slipping below the level of public consciousness that it was at during the 80s and 90s.

I'm going to suggest that the crisis is of two kinds. The first is that the revisionist arguments that were developed in the 70s and 80s were so substantial that succeeding breakthroughs appear to be secondary elaborations of earlier, more fundamental research. That doesn't mean that there is no point to the continuing development of revisionist theory, only that the most startling, the most dramatic, and the most basic work has been done.

Maybe I will be proven wrong about this.

The second element to the crisis in revisionism, in my view, is our failure to take it to academia and media successfully. In Europe this scenario is complicated by the role the State plays in censoring revisionism and imprisoning those who openly express sympathy with revisionism. We can argue that "everyone" is against us, and that is more or less true. That doesn't change the situation. We still have to do the work. We have to take revisionism to academia, and to media, and through those institutions to the people.

The Internet is an absolutely wonderful instrument for revisionism, and at this moment in history it is where revisionism is most healthy. In the long run, the Internet is going to be largely responsible for the survival of revisionist theory, and will be a major cause for the hastening the return of revisionism to public consciousness, thus to media and the professors—the opposite of how it should be in real life.

Meanwhile, here we are now. We can either go along for years, maybe for decades, as we are going along now, waiting patiently for revisionist arguments to seep up through the institutionalized taboo and censorship that keeps it from the immense public it deserves, or we can choose to act, to do what we can, as Robert Faurisson writes (see LETTERS, this issue):

> *... to bring some light to mankind, and some reason to not be too disgusted with ourselves, [for we] have researched this 'Holocaust' and we have found out it is a historical lie. Thanks to our research, and our findings, we affirm, we assert, and we maintain, that that ugly "Holocaust" story is, fortunately for all mankind, a hoax.*

This is the question then: what can we do to take revisionism to academia, to media, and thus to people everywhere? I have an answer. I have been avoiding it for months. Once again, as has happened increasingly in recent months, a reader of *Smith's Report* has proved to be the catalyst for me to make the decision that I have made, and perhaps should have made some months ago.

In mid-September I received an email from D.L. Shier suggesting that it might be a good idea for me to speak at the "Third North American Conference of the Palestine Solidarity Movement." The conference was originally to be held 10—12 October at Rutgers University in New Jersey, but it had come under so much pressure by Jewish and other organizations that it was to be moved to Ohio State U in Columbus. Palestinians and those who support their cause from all over America were going to be present.

Shier's idea was that if I could find a supporter/s in Ohio who would be able to make contacts among those who were going to attend the conference that I might be able, with their help, to get a speaking date during the conference. The conference was going to be a singular event, my appearance there would be a singular event, and could not but help to be good for revisionism.

I responded that it was a good, imaginative idea, but not practical for me to take it on. There wasn't enough time. I had no assurance that I could make the relevant contacts with the right people in a timely way. I did not have a talk worked out that was "framed" for a Palestinian audience. I would have to have the right media lists to contact or I could very well be swallowed up in the all the noise that was to be made by the dozens of other speakers. The project was tantalizing, but not practical.

And then I received an email from Shier where he accepted my concerns:

> *I don't believe the conference is the breakthrough we are looking for. This is only one of a few singular opportunities that I happened to see.*

Then he wrote the magic words. I must have been waiting for someone to say them to me.

> *Why don't you consider a book signing/tour of US college campuses? I am almost finished reading Break His Bones and I think it is a great book. Authors go on tours. You could headline your appearance: 'Meet the Devil in Person' and beat your opposition to the punch.*
>
> *Perhaps supporters can line up a series of meeting rooms and pay for security and advertising. You should create a budget (rental car to haul books, gas, cell phone, etc). Pick an itinerary where you already have contacts. Pick dates during the school year that avoid holidays. Spend weekends in major cities where there are several colleges. Ask volunteers to meet locally to raise the money for your stop in their city. Make a big 30-60 day loop of the country, and put me down as one volunteer.*

Authors go on tours!

Of course authors go on tours!

I have been thinking about going on tour with *Bones* for months. Even before *Bones* was published I imagined myself going on the road with it. At the same time, I thought about how much more practical it would be to stay right where I was and pull publicity strings on campus, radio, and the Internet. The spider sitting in the middle of his "web," sending his vibrations from the center to its outermost reaches. I tried it. It hasn't been working.

Authors go on tour!

That's the one big thing I have not tried. In the 1980s I focused on promoting revisionism via mass mailings to radio, supported by IHR. In the 1990s I focused on promoting revisionism via mass mailings of editorial advertisements to the college student press, with the bulk of the financial costs provided by one individual supporter. Time flies. The times change. New problems, new opportunities.

One traditional way to get a buzz going about your book—if you have a book that is buzzable—is to go on tour with it. I have a book that is buzzable. You don't sell a lot of books on tour, unless you're a Hillary Clinton, say, but that's the way you get the buzz going. It's the buzz that sells the book. My book is meant to create a buzz about revisionism—about "The Pri-

vate Life of a Holocaust Revisionist." The buzz will stir the revisionist pot, and it will sell books.

Shier's email is one of those communications that sometimes arrives at the right moment to say the right thing. I had always taken it for granted that I would "tour" with the book. It would not be the regular author's tour. I would not be welcome in most bookstores. Not at the beginning. I would not be welcome at Rotarian get-togethers. I would be unwelcome almost everywhere. That's just how it is for revisionists.

But going on the road with *Bones*. That's the ticket! When I reflected on it privately, I couldn't decide. When Shier told me that that's what authors do—it was a snap. Of course, that's one of the things that authors do, and it's time for me to do it.

WILL YOU HELP ME WITH MY BOOK TOUR FOR *BREAK HIS BONES*?

This is the first time in America that a Holocaust revisionist author will have gone on tour with his book. A real tour. I've been in this game for twenty-five years: it's never happened.

Can you imagine what kind of press for revisionism such a tour will create? A persistent round of speaking engagements, covered by the media?

I don't want to spell out all my thinking about how to kick off such a tour. The usual reasons for caution very much apply here.

It is plain however that I will focus on getting lecture rooms on campus. At the same time, I will not rule out any other venue.

This will be the second coming of the Campus Project. From a different perspective, with a different tool. Not large display advertisements in student papers, but the presence of their author, in person, on their campus, with his book.

In the beginning it will not be the size of the audience at any particular event that will be important, but how we handle the event.

Once we are rolling—and I'm not saying that it is going to be easy—we can begin thinking about the size of our audiences.

A series of short tours to specific cities or regions—tours of four, five, or ten days might be more practical than setting out on a two or three month expedition. Less expensive in the short run (though admittedly not in the long run) and easier to organize.

Such matters will be decided as we move forward with the project. I will be flexible, work with each of you, and follow the path that appears to be best in each situation.

No idea for the tour will be rejected out of hand.

Will you help me?

Do you have your own ideas about how such a tour might be organized in your city, your part of the state?

Get in touch with me. My numbers are on **page eight** of this Report.

Tell me how you would most like to help. Every offer of help will be appreciated.

Let's work it out.

—Bradley

The reason that Arthur Sulzberger of the *New York Times*, Abraham Foxman of the ADL, and so many others who represent the Holocaust Industry have chosen to focus their attention on my Campus Project is that they understand it is difficult to police the campus. Students are less driven than others to conform. They oftentimes really believe in free inquiry and a free press.

An **SR** reader has sent me a clipping from the Spring 2003 issue of the Simon Wiesenthal Center's "Holocaust and Genocide Studies" that is relevant here. He writes:

> *It has a review by Alan L. Berger of Frederick J. Simonelli's book American Fuehrer: George Lincoln Rockwell and the American Nazi Party. This is the 'first scholarly biography of Rockwell. Rockwell's father was the vaudeville comedian Doc Rockwell. Jack Benny, George Burns, and Groucho Marx attended his christening. Norman Rockwell was his uncle.*
>
> *"Alan Berger writes that Rockwell 'gave widespread publicity to Holocaust denial long before Bradley Smith and others did so.' What is implied here is that you are Numero Uno! Congratulations."*

Scholars at the SWC reference me because of the work I have done on campus. I want to get back there. With a lecture tour and a book that are structured to demonstrate to students, and to the odd professor, that revisionists are not agents of Satan, and that intellectual freedom is good, not evil.

(Continued from page 6)

John Silber indulged himself with in his Open Letter to Colleges and Universities. If the presidents and chancellors of great (or at least big) universities are willing to use this kind of careless language, what are we to expect of their students? This exchange has convinced me that I should address this issue on the World Wide Web.

Here is Sam Wilkinson's letter to John Rev(isionist), with MacKenzie's responses (edited for space) in italics.

Sam Wilkinson
Managing Editor
Massachusetts Daily Collegian

Dear Mr. Rev,

Having received your insulting letter about our decision not to publish the advertisements that Bradley Smith sent us, I feel the need to write and explain myself.

Because you decided to attempt to woo me to your side through the use of insult. . .

Whoaaah! Hold the phone. Who on earth has ever attempted to woo someone to their side by insulting them? If you were insulted by John's analogies, that's your problem. If you were wooed by his analogies, that, too, is your problem. If it was both, you have a very big problem. Perhaps you should see a shrink.

. . .you suggested that I simply am too stupid to think critically about things like the Holocaust. You would suggest that, under pressure from the local Rabbi or ADL or Hillel, I simply folded, and of course, you are absolutely wrong. While the advertisement was brought to my attention by others,

"Others"? What "others", Sam? Perhaps the very same people you just mentioned?

I personally wrote the editorial saying that we would never again publish any of Bradley Smith's propoganda. I made the decision that we never again would. We were not pressured; we made that decision ourselves.

Which is it Sam? "I" or "we"? I happen to know that your advertising department contacted Smith and ASKED to run his ad. I also happen to know, through my association, that your staff didn't find anything wrong with the ad. But it was pulled within two days of the first appearance. And by the way, your continued use of the term "never again" is telling in ways most likely beyond your comprehension and seems extremely naïve for a student who will, with luck, be graduating and moving on some day. Or do you plan to be a career student just so that you can guard the Daily Collegian from such people as Bradley?

I called Bradley Smith and spoke to him, explaining to him that he should never contact us again. Your letter, I can only imagine, is his stupid way of getting around my request.

You can't imagine, even for a moment Sam, that John's letter was from John, just as your decision to cut the ad was yours? Bradley's voice is strong and well heard. John is a revisionist with his own voice. I am a revisionist with my own voice. There are tens of thousands of us out here, Sam. Bradley is just helping our voices be heard.

That you believe that the Holocaust did not happen is ignorant and foolish.

WHO said that the holocaust did not happen? John? Bradley? Where and when? Let's see the quotes! And how dare you, the one who is "denying" freedom of the press, accuse anyone of ignorance or foolishness, when you don't have the faintest idea what you are talking about. Please define the holocaust, Sam. What precisely was the holocaust?

That you would trample on the stories and lives and deaths of so many families is embarrassing.

How can you be embarrassed by simply giving your readers access to the other side of a story? How can you be embarrassed by allowing one man to speak, through a paid advertisement, for the millions of others who also suffered during world war two? Who is trampling on whom here? You should be embarrassed, I agree, but for your ignorance and intolerance, not for anything Bradley published in the Daily Collegian.

That you would write to me to engage in some sort of verbal dispute with me is absolutely outrageous.

Oh, Lord, this takes the cake. Now a letter to the editor is an "absolutely outrageous" "verbal dispute"? Remind me to notify major papers around the free world that letters to the editor are "absolutely outrageous".

You ignore overwhelming factual information to present your own beliefs. You attempt to spread your word as best you can, and that included advertising in this paper. But as I explained to Bradley >Smith, I now explain to you: the Freedom of the Press affords anyone the right to publish whatever it is that they want and I would fight to the death for you to have the right to publish your ignorant filth. But never will I stand here and allow you, on my dime and in my press, publish your lies. I own this press and you don't have the freedom to use it. Neither does Bradley Smith. Neither do the rest of the ignorant individuals that follow you. You sir are a liar, a man filled with such hate that one wonders what happened to you over the years. Do not waste my time with your emails. Do not waste my time with your letters. Take your hate filled speech elsewhere.

I am not interested.

Sam, one last word of advice. Never write something so emotional and passionate, however misguided,

(Continued on page 8)

and then tell your reader that you are not interested. If you hadn't been interested you would have dumped John's letter in the "round file". Your final statement was insincere. Your entire letter was childish and shrill. If you're going to speak for your beliefs and convictions, you should do so like a professional.

MacKenzie Paine

If you would like to have a knee-slapping good time reading the complete exchanges between MacKenzie and Sam Wilkinson, as well as MacKenzie's complete destruction of Dr. Andrew Leslie, Communications professor at Wake Forest University, send along a couple bucks (or more — or much more), and "we", (meaning the extremely well organized, highly efficient Audrey), will send them along to you. Also included will be a gentle piece wherein MacKenzie has a terrific dialogue with a Jewish broadcasting major from Arizona State University.

The Shrine of Righteous Jews

Tom Ehrlich

In a small plot of land adjacent to a garbage dump, one can make out two lonely wine bottles, covered with dust, and adorned with flowers. As unprepossessing as they may appear, they betoken a priceless legacy.

The plot is tended by an elderly Mexican farmer named Juan. His tattered panama drenched with sweat in the Southwestern heat, he patiently adorns the bottles with wreaths of dandelions he has crafted himself. This is the shrine of the Righteous Jews.

Juan relates how he got the idea for setting up the shrine. "I was in Los Angeles to visit my daughter there, and, on the way back I decided to stop at the Museum of Tolerance. There I was able to see videotapes in Spanish about the garden for Righteous Gentiles the Israelis have in their country. It seems that for every gentile who saved the life of a Jew in the Holocaust, they planted a tree there. I thought, why can't I do something like that?"

Thousands of trees at Yad Vashem indicate the gratitude of the Jewish people for those few non-Jews who, by saving the life of a Jew, saved the whole world. The other 280 million Europeans, it appears, did nothing.

"I decided that, if the Jews can have a garden to plant trees for non-Jews, why shouldn't I, as a non-Jew, set up a garden for Jews?"

So Juan patiently set to work, cleaning the broken glass, plastic bags, and used tires from the designated plot, and carefully raking the hard-stubble ground that cannot support plant life.

And so it was that Juan decided to adorn his shrine with empty wine bottles, garlanded with flowers. But, unlike the garden at Yad Vashem, which requires extensive documentation that a non-Jew has in fact saved a Jewish life, and which boasts a stringent vetting process, Juan's standards are different — almost, we might say, more humanistic. To qualify for memorialization in the Shrine of Righteous Jews, one doesn't have to show that a Jew has saved a non-Jewish life, all that is necessary is to show that a Jew has done something nice for a non-Jew.

"I didn't want to have to wait a long time to set up the shrine", confided Juan. "I am sure that Jews have saved the lives of many many non-Jews, since 40% of Nobel Prize winners are either Jewish or of Jewish background and the Nobel Prize is awarded only to those who have contributed the most to the betterment of mankind", continued Juan, quoting from a Jewish encyclopedia.

But do the two bottles in Juan's shrine represent two of these Jewish Nobelists? Elie Wiesel, perhaps, or Yitzhak Shamir? No. The first bottle is dedicated to the attorney who arranged for Juan's divorce, while the second commemorates the attorney who helped Juan through the bankruptcy proceedings afterwards.

Here, in a desolate spot, lies a monument to interfaith understanding and communication. A glorious legacy honoring those few Jews, who, by extraordinary acts, made a difference in the life of non-Jews. A monument that bluntly implies the humanity of a few, and the depravity of the rest. Just like at Yad Vashem.

THE LAST WORD

Another month, a little late, a big mailing going out to campuses today. Moving all shipping and printing operations to Baja or close to the frontier. I'm going to get a handle on those problems. Yesterday, 30,000-plus accesses registered on CODOHWeb. There's no stopping us, unless we stop each other.

Thanks for all your support.

Bradley

Smith's Report

Committee for Open Debate on the Holocaust (CODOH)

For your contribution of $29 you will receive eleven issues of ***Smith's Report***
[$35 Canada and Mexico
$39 overseas]

All checks and correspondence to

Bradley R. Smith
Post Office Box 439016
San Diego, CA 92143

T & F: 858 309 4385
Voice Mail: 619 687 1950

E-mail: CODOHMail@aol.com

www.codoh.org